

REMARKS

In response to the office action, a drawing is now presented and described in the specification, the drawing and added language to the specification not comprising new matter.

Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to correct typographical errors pointed out by the Examiner. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors, ambiguities and vagueness issues pointed out by the Examiner.

Applicant contends that the title of the application as filed is an appropriate title, but would be amenable to amending the title to one suggested by the Examiner. Applicant submits the present title is as clearly indicative of the invention as for example the titles of the cited prior art - "Information Communication System" and "Building Intelligence System".

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of the independent claims, and the claims dependent thereon, under Section 102 in view of Ivie et al. '730. As set forth more fully in MPEP 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference". *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim". *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claims 1 and 11 require the system to comprise:

- a. a central distribution point housing non-interactive components
- b. a multimedia distribution point housing interactive controls
- c. cabling connecting the multimedia distribution point to the central

distribution point

- d. cabling connecting the central distribution point to multiple rooms
- e. cabling connecting the multimedia distribution point to multiple rooms
- f. whereby various electronic devices can be located in any of the multiple rooms and connected to the cabling from either the central distribution point, the multimedia distribution point or both
- g. whereby the various electronic devices can be controlled from within each of the multiple rooms or from the multimedia distribution point.

Elements a, b, c and d are common to known systems, and this is the extent of the system described in the Ivie patent. However, neither Ivie or other known prior art describes a system wherein the multimedia distribution point is connected to multiple rooms (e) such that electronic devices can connected to cabling from either the central distribution point, the multimedia distribution point or both (f) and such that the electronic devices can be controlled from within the multiple rooms or from the multimedia distribution point.

As is clear from a careful reading of the specification and the claims, and examination of the drawings, this is not a system that simply comprises speakers set out in various rooms that are cabled back to the multimedia distribution point. Instead, the system comprises electronic devices in multiple rooms, each of which is cabled back to either or both of the distribution points (one non-interactive and one interactive) such that commands can be generated within the separate rooms or at the multimedia distribution point, with the commands routing back to either the multimedia center or the central distribution center.

In Ivie, all cabling routes back to the central distribution point and there are no elements that comprise cabling connections from the rooms to the multimedia distribution point as well as the central distribution point. The Examiner is incorrect in describing the utilization of a jack,

i.e., plugging in a component, as being interactive control. The term "interactive control" has well established meaning in the industry as comprising action performed by a user to control operational aspects of the electronic equipment, e.g., adjusting the volume, changing channels, requesting information, etc. The Examiner cites a number of passages from Ivie regarding this point, yet none of these passages reference any of the claimed structure expressly or inherently. As such, it is submitted that rejection of the claims under Section 102 is improper given the applicable standards.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as presented are patentable, on the basis of the above remarks, and reconsideration and subsequent passage for allowance is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas C. Saitta, Reg. No. 32102
Attorney for Applicant

Rogers Towers, P.A.
1301 Riverplace Blvd.
Suite 1500
Jacksonville, FL 32207
904-346-5518
904-396-0663 (fax)